REMARKS

In the application, Claims 6, and 9-14 are pending and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,560,640 (Smethers) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,250,930 (Mintz).

As an initial matter, regarding the Examiner's assertion that Mintz discloses "[a] variety of multimedia file formats such as those that would employ a 'browser ID' in the bookmark field such as a file extension that directs the rendering system to use the appropriate 'browser' tool, as in Microsoft Word or Microsoft Excel, in addition to ordinary html and the incorporable .gif and .jpg components that appear online" (Office Action, Page 7, emphasis removed), it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. The "variety of multimedia file formats," ".gif" and ".jpg" which the Examiner refers to above, clearly refers to the actual filenames and extensions as opposed to a bookmark. Furthermore, even assuming that the Examiner's assertion was correct, as taught by the claims of the present invention, the bookmark includes a browser ID in addition to the URL in a bookmark. This feature is neither taught nor suggested by Mintz.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 6, the Examiner states that the combination of Smethers and Mintz teaches each and every element of Claim 6. After reviewing the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. More specifically, the Examiner states that Smethers teaches "selecting one of

a plurality of bookmarks, wherein each bookmark includes a URL (Uniform Resource Locator)" (Office Action, Page 2). The Examiner apparently equates the step of selecting one of a plurality of bookmarks as recited in Claim 6, with the compact request as taught by Smethers. Smethers teaches a "compact bookmark identifier and not including a universal resource locator for the selected bookmark page." (Column 3, Lines 40-44, emphasis added). Moreover, Smethers teaches "[n]either the compact bookmark identifier nor the compact request include a universal resource locator [URL] for the selected bookmarked document" (Column 2, Lines 63-65), which clearly teaches away from the present invention. This deficiency is not cured by Mintz which teaches opening a plurality of browsers in a memo, message, survey, questionnaire or direct mail piece for conducting opinion surveys.

In contrast, Claim 6 includes the recitation of selecting one of a plurality of bookmarks, wherein each bookmark includes a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) field for saving an address of an Internet resource and a browser ID used to select a corresponding browser from the plurality of browsers capable of browsing the Internet resource having a unique protocol, which is neither taught nor suggested by Smethers or Mintz or the combination thereof. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 6 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 12, the Examiner states that the combination of Smethers and Mintz teaches each and every element of Claim 12. Claim 12 includes the recitation of assigning a bookmark file and allocating an ID

corresponding to the selected browser in the assigned bookmark file, and inputting a URL of the Internet resource having the unique protocol in the assigned bookmark file. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 12 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 14, Claim 14 includes the recitation of a program residing on the memory and being executable by the controller to select a bookmark, the bookmark including a browser ID corresponding to a particular browser, and a URL, which is neither taught nor suggested by Smethers or Mintz or the combination thereof. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 6, 12 and 14 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 9-11 and 13, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 9-11 and 13, is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 6 and 9-14, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining

matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully yours,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml